



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,282	02/24/2004	Shin-Tson Wu	UCF-388	2414
7590 07/26/2005 Law Offices of Brian S. Steinberger 101 Brevard Avenue Cocoa, FL 32922			EXAMINER CALEY, MICHAEL H	
			ART UNIT 2871	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/786,282

Applicant(s)

WU ET AL.

Examiner

Michael H. Caley

Art Unit

2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,6,7,13-15,18 and 19 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02242004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 13-15, 18, and 19 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Regarding claim 1, line 1: "LDC" should read as -LCD—

Regarding claims 1 and 13, the limitation "a second substrate as the common electrode;" contradicts standard meanings of the terms "substrate" and "electrode" since an electrode is electrically conductive and a substrate is normally electrically insulating. From review of the specification, the examiner has not found any special definition or description of the second substrate or common electrode to warrant the unusual description and it is presumed to be in error. It is suggested that the above phrase be amended to describe the second substrate and common electrode similarly to how the first substrate and pixel electrode are described, such as — a second substrate with a common electrode—

Further regarding claim 1, part (f) reads: "the circular polarizer disposed on exterior surfaces of the liquid crystal cell". The specification, however, describes a circular polarizer as disposed on a single exterior surface. It is recommended that part (f) of the claim be amended to indicate a plurality of circular polarizers as disposed on respective exterior surfaces or to indicate the circular polarizer as disposed on a single exterior surface.

Art Unit: 2871

Regarding claims 2, 3, 14, and 15, “second substrate” should read as –common electrode—in accordance with the above objection of claim 1.

Regarding claims 6, 7, 18, and 19, “protrusion electrode” should read as –pixel electrode—so as to avoid confusion and issue of antecedent basis.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-9, 13, 14, 16, and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2003/0160928 “Ozawa”) in view of Arakawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,400,433 “Arakawa”).

Regarding claim 1, Ozawa discloses a flower-shaped vertical alignment structure liquid crystal display with fast response, high contrast ratio and wide view angle comprising:

a first substrate (Figure 5 element 10A) with a protrusion shaped electrode (Figure 5 element 9) as the pixel electrode;

a second substrate as the common electrode (Figure 5 elements 25A and 31);

aligning layers formed on the first and second substrates providing liquid crystal vertical alignment (Figure 5 elements 23 and 33);

liquid crystal materials (Figure 5 element 50) filling a space between the first and second substrates as a liquid crystal cell; and

a circular polarizer disposed on an exterior surface of the liquid crystal cell.

Ozawa fails to disclose the circular polarizer as formed of a linear polarizer and wide band quarter-wave film. Arakawa, however, teaches a circular polarizer as advantageously comprising a linear polarizer and a wide-band quarter wave film so that light may be uniformly polarized across visible wavelengths of light (abstract, Column 3 lines 1-9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have formed the circular polarizer from a linear polarizer and wide band quarter wave film as proposed. One would have been motivated to form the circular polarizer accordingly such that uniform polarization may occur across the visible range of light as is preferred in a color liquid crystal display as disclosed by Ozawa (Arakawa: Column 1 lines 12-32).

Regarding claim 2, Ozawa discloses the second substrate as having an empty hole (Figure 5 element 31M).

Regarding claim 4, Ozawa discloses the aligning layer as a polymer (Page 5 [0067]).

Art Unit: 2871

Regarding claim 6, Ozawa discloses the protrusion electrode as having a shape selected from at least one of: conic, spherical, semi-spherical tower, pyramid and column-like (Figures 4 and 5 element 21).

Regarding claim 7, Ozawa discloses the protrusion electrode as including an indium tin oxide layer (Page 5 [0067]).

Regarding claim 8, Ozawa discloses the shape of the empty hole as selected from at least one of: circular, elliptical ring-shaped, square and rectangular (Figures 4 and 5 element 31M).

Regarding claim 9, Ozawa discloses the common electrode as including an ITO layer (Page 5 [0068]).

Regarding claims 13, 14, 16 and 18-21, Ozawa discloses the steps applying a voltage to the LCD to generate an electric field distribution having a flower blossom configuration in order to provide the LCD with the wide view angle, fast response, and high contrast ratio (Figure 5 element 50B; Page 6 [0077], Page 1 [0002]).

Claims 3 and 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozawa in view of Arakawa and in further view of Shimoshikiryo (U.S. Patent No. 6,850,301).

Ozawa as modified by Arakawa discloses all of the proposed limitations except for the hole as having a hexagon shape. Shimoshikiryo, however, teaches a hexagon shaped holes as an

Art Unit: 2871

alternative to a square, circle, or other polygon, due to their ability to be closely arranged on an electrode and their ability to produce a more axially symmetrical orientation (Column 31 line 66 – Column 32 line 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have formed the hole disclosed by Arakawa to have a hexagon shape. One would have been motivated to use a hexagon shape as an alternative to a rectangular shape due to its ability to produce a more axially symmetric orientation and its ability to be more closely arranged to other holes of the same type (Column 31 line 66 – Column 32 line 10).

Claims 5 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozawa in view of Arakawa and in further view of Lu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,426,786 “Lu”).

Regarding claim 5, Ozawa as modified by Arakawa fails to disclose the aligning layer as an inorganic layer. Lu, however, teaches an inorganic aligning layer as advantageous due to its stable chemical properties in enduring exposure to various types of illumination (Column 3 lines 48-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have formed the aligning layer of the display device disclosed by Ozawa from an inorganic material. One would have been motivated to use an inorganic material to extend the service life of the alignment layer and display (Column 3 lines 48-55).

Claims 10 and 22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozawa in view of Arakawa and in further view of Ikeda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,671,025 “Ikeda”).

Ozawa as modified by Arakawa fails to disclose the common electrode as including wall-bump protrusions on the ITO layer. Ikeda, however, teaches bump protrusions and slits as interchangeable to achieve a common effect of establishing liquid crystal alignment partitions (Figures 6A and 6B; Column 8 line 52 – Column 9 line 20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have form bump protrusions on the common electrode ITO layer in the display device disclosed by Ozawa. One would have been motivated to form bump protrusions as an alternative method of forming the alignment partitions on the counter substrate (Column 8 line 52 – Column 9 line 20).

Claims 11 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozawa in view of Arakawa and in further view of Matsuyama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,969,781 “Matsuyama”).

Ozawa as modified by Arakawa is silent on the dielectric anisotropy of the liquid crystal. Matsuyama teaches a vertically aligned mode display as compatible with either a positive or negative dielectric anisotropy liquid crystal. Matsuyama teaches further advantages of a positive negative dielectric anisotropy in that it may attain higher contrast levels than a negative dielectric anisotropy liquid crystal (Column 5 lines 43-56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the display device disclosed by Ozawa with a liquid crystal material having

Art Unit: 2871

positive dielectric anisotropy. One would have been motivated to choose a liquid crystal material having positive dielectric anisotropy to benefit from the expected results of such a parameter such as increased contrast as taught by Matsuyama.

Claim 12 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozawa in view of Arakawa and in further view of Yoshida et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,512,564 "Yoshida").

Ozawa as modified by Arakawa is silent on the dielectric anisotropy of the liquid crystal. Yoshida teaches a liquid crystal display as compatible with either a positive or negative dielectric anisotropy liquid crystal. Yoshida teaches further advantages of a negative dielectric anisotropy in that it is more compatible with a vertical alignment layer (Column 13 lines 9-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the display device disclosed by Ozawa with a liquid crystal material having negative dielectric anisotropy. One would have been motivated to choose a liquid crystal material having positive dielectric anisotropy to benefit from the expected results of such a parameter such better compatibility with a vertical alignment layer as taught by Yoshida.

Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozawa in view of Arakawa and in further view of Koma (U.S. Patent No. 5,666,179).

Regarding claim 25, Ozawa as modified by Arakawa discloses each of the proposed limitations except for the electric field as having generally expanding concentric patterns. Koma, however teaches such a field exhibited by the orientation of the liquid crystal directors

Art Unit: 2871

and symmetry of the electrode layout (Figures 6 and 7). Koma teaches such an electrode and electric field as advantageous to provide a uniform viewing angle characteristic at all viewing angle directions (Column 5 lines 42-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have formed the electric field to have generally expanding concentric patterns in the display device disclosed by Ozawa. One would have been motivated to design the display for such an electric field as an optimization of the display for a particular viewing angle characteristic as taught by Koma in which the viewing angle characteristic is uniform at all viewing angle directions (Column 5 lines 42-60).

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael H. Caley whose telephone number is (571) 272-2286. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Kim can be reached on (571) 272-2293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2871


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael H. Caley

July 20, 2005



mhc



ROBERT H. KIM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800